



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,421	04/23/2001	Amir Hekmatpour	RAL20000098US1	4181
25299	7590	02/09/2004	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION PO BOX 12195 DEPT 9CCA, BLDG 002 RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709			NGUYEN, CINDY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2171	
DATE MAILED: 02/09/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/840,421

Applicant(s)

HEKMATPOUR, AMIR

Examiner

Cindy Nguyen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 20, 21 and 25-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-19, 22-24, 29-35 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to application filed on 04/23/01 in which claims 1-35 are presented for examination.

1. *Information Disclosure Statement*

The information disclosure statement filed on 04/23/01 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. Because it has been placed in the application file, and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

2. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. **Claims 1-3, 20, 21 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Helgeson et al. (U.S 6643652) (Helgeson).**

Regarding claims 1 and 28, Helgeson discloses: A computer-based design framework and a computer program product for collaborative design of a product comprising: a virtual database management system (col. 134, lines 26-27, Helgeson), which receives data from a plurality of sources and creates a single database interface to said sources (col. 135, lines 5-46, Helgeson); software code associated with said virtual database management system for mapping various informational structures utilized by said sources to a common syntax (col. 135, lines 46 to col.

Art Unit: 2171

136, lines 4, Helgeson); and additional logic associated with said virtual database management system that provides a set of publishing rules for extracting information on demand and publishing said extracted information in a format recognized by a requestor of said information (col. 135, lines 1-46, Helgeson).

In addition, Helgeson discloses: a computer readable medium (219, fig. 2, Helgeson); and program code on said computer readable medium for enabling collaborative design of a product (221, fig. 2 and corresponding text, Helgeson).

Regarding claim 2, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Helgeson discloses: wherein: each of said distinct sources represents a design team with one or more design team members provided access to said virtual database management system via a network; and said common syntax is an eXtensible Markup Language (XML) (col. 111, lines 2 to col. 112, lines 65, Helgeson).

Regarding claim 3, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Helgeson discloses: further comprising program code for providing platform-independent application and services exchange utilizing XML wrapped data, service, and application that is delivered to a client (col. 89, lines 35-60, Helgeson).

Regarding claim 20, Helgeson discloses: A method for distributed, collaborative design of a product in a computer-network based design environment, said method comprising: establishing a network-accessible design framework that enables remote access to individual members or groups of a design team (115-118, fig. 1 and corresponding text, Helgeson); normalizing a set of tools within said design framework for utilization by each of said individual members or groups, wherein said tools are available via said network (col. 111, lines

2 to col. 112, lines 65, Helgeson); providing secured access to said design framework by said individual members and groups from a terminal connected to said network (col. 92, lines 32 to col. 93, lines 25, Helgeson); providing, via said design framework and said terminals, real-time collaborative design of said product design with platform-independent application and service exchange utilizing eXtensible Markup Language (XML) wrapped data, service and applications (col. 89, lines 35-60, Helgeson).

Regarding claim 21, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 20 above. In addition, Helgeson discloses: wherein said normalizing step includes: providing the automated exchange of design data via XML functionality, wherein a set of rules defining XML tags are utilized to define a structure, format, and content of design data components that are exchanged (col. 83, lines 43-65, Helgeson); providing processing and searching of data utilizing XML-based search tools that use data structure and meta data; and enabling both local and remote processing of said data (col. 83, lines 43-65, Helgeson).

Regarding claim 25, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 20 above. In addition, Helgeson discloses: wherein said providing step comprises providing said secured access to said design framework via a LAN (115-118, fig. 1 and corresponding text, Helgeson) that includes a database of user parameters including login identification, password, level of security, and types of access (col. 92, lines 32 to col. 93, lines 25, Helgeson).

Regarding claim 26, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 20 above. In addition, Helgeson discloses: wherein said design framework is a set of program code stored on a server on the internet (col. 11, lines 9 to col. 12, lines 5, Helgeson) , said providing step

Art Unit: 2171

further comprising accessing said design framework via a web browser on a computer system connected to the Internet (col. 12, lines 11-39, Helgeson).

Regarding claim 27, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 26 above. In addition, Helgeson discloses: creating a database of user access parameters, including user identification, password, level of access permissions, group access permission, and tasks to which a user has access (col. 92, lines 32 to col. 93, lines 25, Helgeson); monitoring each request for access to said framework; providing access to said framework only when a requester correctly enters required user access parameters, wherein said requestor is only provided access to areas of said design framework corresponding to those areas specified in a user profile associated with said user access parameters (col. 40, lines 30 to col. 41, lines 25, Helgeson).

4. Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 4-19, 22-24 and 29-35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record and that encountered while searching for the claimed invention fails to anticipate and/or suggest: A computer-based design framework and a computer program product for collaborative design of a product comprising: wherein said XML is expanded with SOC-specific attribute type definitions to generate a SOC markup language (SOCML) that supports

Art Unit: 2171

plurality of functional components that operate according to SOCML design specification as recited in claims 4 and 29.

Regarding claims 5-8 and 30-35, these claims depend from claims 4 and 29 respectively and are therefore allowable.

The prior art of record and that encountered while searching for the claimed invention fails to anticipate and/or suggest: A computer-based design framework and a computer program product for collaborative design of a product comprising: wherein said program code for providing platform independent application and services exchanges includes a universal description discovery and interrogation (UDDI) director for locating services and exchange data and service according to simple object access protocol (SOAP) as recited in claim 9.

Regarding claims 10-19, these claims depend from claim 9 and are therefore allowable.

The prior art of record and that encountered while searching for the claimed invention fails to anticipate and/or suggest: wherein said product is a system-on-a chip (SOC), further comprising enabling said collaborative features of said design framework utilizing a system on a chip extensible markup language (SOCML) that allows cross-interaction between different design teams utilizing different tools as recited in claim 22.

Regarding claims 23 and 24, these claims depend from claim 22 and are therefore allowable.

5. Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-4698. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 2171

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

CN
Cindy Nguyen
February 4, 2004

Wayne
WAYNE AMSBURY
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER